safety of the State. The Regulation proceeded on the principle that "prevention is better than cure." Only mischievous people had to be afraid of the Regulation. To others there was absolutely no inconvenience. He referred to the opinion of Lord Cromer who had advocated the liberty of the press in Egypt for over 20 years but had had to change his opinion after actual experience of a free press. He did not for a moment think that Government was actuated by any other motive than the protection and welfare of the subjects. The Regulation was moreover a preventive measure, and though a similar measure had been in force in the Civil and Military Station for 18 years there was no occasion to enforce it. So it would happen in Mysore also and there was no cause for alarm. He was of opinion that the Regulation should be retained intact and that Government should first warn erring editors before taking other steps.

Mr. Bhima Rao (Pleader, Kolar) expressed himself in favour of judicial action such as existed in British India. Mr. Subba Rao (Land-holder, Chitaldrug) saw no use of judicial trials and preferred to have the Regulation as it was if it could not be repealed. Mr. Nallappa (Land-holder, Tumkur) said that the law was for the good of the people and should not be repealed.

The sense of the Assembly as to whether the Newspapers Regulation should be repealed was ascertained by a show of hands and it was found that only 36 members out of 173 present were in favour of repeal.

Reply of Government.—No change is necessary.

Subject No. 8.

The Village Panchayat.

(*a*) Messrs. K. Shankaranarayan Rao, Nagar Sabha; C. Nagappa, Nagar Taluk; Chik Ramanna, Suryanarnappa, Sonne Gowda and Byre Gowda, Kolar Taluk; Rama Rao, Malur Taluk; Surappa, Tumkur Taluk; Ramachandraiah, Bangalore District Board; Veerappa Reddi and Chik Guruva Reddi, Bangalore Taluk; Adirajappa, Pavagada Taluk; Srinivas Sitaram Kulkarni, Harihar Sub-Taluk; Davood Sab, Thimma Setty, Mudgere Taluk; Siddagangappa, Chamrajnagar Taluk; Malali Venkatramiah, Manjarabad Taluk; Kesaviengar, Belur Taluk.

(*b*) Messrs. Guru Rao, Padmanna, Venkatasubbaiya, Nanjangud Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) Village Courts may be constituted with power to try petty suits.

(*b*) The Village Munsiffs' Act may be introduced.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered early.

Subject No. 9.

Introduction of the Small Cause Courts Regulation.

Messrs. C. Subba Rao, Shimoga District Board, and B. Subbanna, Law Association, Bangalore.

Summary of discussion.—The Small Cause Courts Regulation may be introduced into the State. Small causes should be defined and greater powers of revision given to the Chief Court.

Reply of Government.—Will be taken up soon.

Subject No. 10.

Extradition Act.

Mr. Kesaviengar, Belur Taluk, and Mr. Pilkington, North Mysore Planters' Association.

Summary of discussion.—Breaches of contract may be made extraditable.

Reply of Government.—If a representation is made on behalf of the Planters' Associations further action will be taken.